

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
Public Law 89-796
S. 688

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of S. 688.	.1
Digest of Public Law 89-796.	.2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF S. 688

Jan.	18, 1965	Rep. Sikes introduced H. R. 3018 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Jan.	26, 1965	Sen. Holland introduced S. 688 which was referred to Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Mar.	17, 1965	Rep. Matthews introduced H. R. 6402 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
Sept.	21, 1965	Senate committee voted to report S. 688.
Oct.	5, 1966	Senate committee reported S. 688 with amendments. S. Report 1676. Print of bill and report.
Oct.	7, 1966	Senate passed S. 688 as reported.
Oct.	10, 1966	S. 688 was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as referred.
Oct.	17, 1966	House passed S. 688 under suspension of the rules.
Nov.	8, 1966	Approved: Public Law 89-796. Statement of President when signing bill.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-796

RURAL RENEWAL LOANS. Amends title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to extend loan eligibility to non-profit organizations for rural renewal activities. Provides that funds for recreation may be included in overall renewal loans rather than requiring a separate loan docket for recreation purposes only, and permits Farmers Home Administration and local groups to view entire renewal proposals, including recreation, as a single development.

H. R. 3018

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 18, 1965

Mr. SIKES introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm
4 Tenant Act (50 Stat. 525), as amended, is amended by in-
5 serting after the words "protecting fish and wildlife", the
6 word, "recreation", and by amending section 32 (e) of said
7 Act by inserting after the words "and local public agencies"
8 the words, "and local nonprofit organizations" in both first
9 and second sentences of said subsection.

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3018

A BILL

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SIKES

JANUARY 18, 1965

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

S. 688

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 26, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm
4 Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010), is amended by
5 inserting “developing and protecting recreational facilities,”
6 immediately after “protecting fish and wildlife,”.

7 (b) Section 32 (e) of title III of such Act is amended
8 by—

9 (1) inserting “, and local nonprofit organizations”

1 immediately after “and other public agencies” in the
2 first sentence thereof; and

3 (2) inserting “and to local nonprofit organizations”
4 immediately after “local public agencies” in the second
5 sentence thereof.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 688

A BILL

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones
Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide
for additional means and measures for land
conservation and land utilization, and for
other purposes.

By Mr. HOLLAND

JANUARY 26, 1965

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

H. R. 6402

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 17, 1965

Mr. MATTHEWS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm
4 Tenant Act (50 Stat. 525), as amended, is amended by in-
5 serting after the words "protecting fish and wildlife", the
6 word "recreation", and by amending section 32 (e) of said
7 Act by inserting after the words "and local public agencies"
8 the words "and local nonprofit organizations" in both first
9 and second sentences of said subsection.

89TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6402

A BILL

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MATTHEWS

MARCH 17, 1965

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Sept. 22, 1966
For actions of Sept. 21, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 160

CONTENTS

Agricultural policy.....26	Flood control.....18	Personnel.....11,12
Appropriations.....10,14	Food supply.....29	Public works.....14
Awards.....12	Foreign aid.....9,27	Reclamation.....36
Buildings.....3	Hay.....30	Recreation.....1,17
Child nutrition.....5,13	Health.....10	Rural areas.....25
Congressional.....	Information.....33	Salt-water research.....7
reorganization...6,19,31	Inspection services.....21	Seeds.....1
Conservation.....17,20	Interest rates.....37	Supergrades.....11
Cooperatives.....2	Jellyfish.....17	Transportation.....10
Copyright law.....16	Job Corps.....8	Urban affairs.....24
Corn.....26	Lands.....35	Veterans' benefits.....34
Disaster relief.....30	Legislative.....	Water supply.....18,28
Education.....10	accomplishments...22,23	Watersheds.....15
Federal aid.....32	Legislative program....10	Wildlife.....17
Feed.....30	Loans.....1	
Fish protein.....17	Minerals.....4	

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on child nutrition bill. Senate committee voted to report bills to authorize rural-renewal loans for recreation, revise Seed Act, and permit holding of prepayments of FHA loans. Sen. Jordan announced hearings on revised Aiken bill to prevent handlers from treating cooperatives unfairly. House agreed to conference report on bill to authorize additional supergrade positions. Rep. Callaway criticized USDA announcement of regulation change re withdrawal of certain inspection services.

SENATE

1. LOANS; SEEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 688, to authorize rural-renewal loans for recreation and to non-profit organizations; H. R. 15662, to revise the Federal Seed Act; and H. R. 15510, to permit the Department to hold prepayments to the Farmers Home Administration on loans. p. D900
2. COOPERATIVES. Sen. Aiken submitted an amendment which he intends to propose as a substitute for S. 109, to prevent handlers from treating cooperatives

unfairly. The amendment was printed in the Record. Sen. Jordan announced that hearings will be held Sept. 28. pp. 22632, 22633-4

3. BUILDINGS. Passed as reported H. R. 14019, to authorize additional appropriations for Government buildings in foreign countries. pp. 22562-4
4. MINERALS. Passed as reported S. 3485, to establish standards for determining whether a particular amendment is a common variety under the Common Varieties Act and therefore subject to leasing. pp. 22564-6
5. CHILD NUTRITION. Sen. Proxmire expressed satisfaction at legislative progress of the child nutrition bill. p. 22592
6. CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION. The Special Committee on the Organization of Congress reported ^{S. 3848} the proposed Legislative Reorganization Act of 1966 (S. Rept. 1629). Sen. Monroney said: "It enlarges the role of the General Accounting Office in making a greater variety of budgetary data--suitable for computer programming--available to all Members and by providing expert staff assistance in GAO to be on call by the standing committees to assist in modern program evaluation techniques. It provides for more frequent budget updating and more long-range projections of continuing programs. It requires an analysis of the budgetary consequences of new legislation by the legislative committees. It recommends a more open, output oriented appropriations review... It attempts to rationalize congressional scheduling by providing for an August recess period in the event the business of the session has not been concluded by the legal adjournment date of July 31." pp. 22656-8
7. SALT-WATER RESEARCH. Passed without amendment S. 3823, to authorize the Interior Department to participate in construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant. pp. 22667-70
8. JOB CORPS. Sen. Dominick criticized administration of the Job Corps program. pp. 22670-4
9. FOREIGN AID. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 194, to authorize the President to designate Oct. 31 of each year as National UNICEF Day. p. 22628
10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield stated his hope that the Labor-HEW appropriation bill will be reported today, in which event it is to be considered tomorrow, September 23; and that, if reported this week, the bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and the health and education bills, will be considered next week. p. 22620

HOUSE

11. SUPERGRADES. Agreed to the conference report on S. 2393, to authorize 300 additional positions at GS-16, 17, and 18. p. 22424
12. AWARDS. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported S. 2463, to grant the consent of the Congress to acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments (H. Rept. 2052). p. 22559
13. CHILD NUTRITION. Received the conference report on S. 3467, the child nutrition bill (H. Rept. 2063). The conferees accepted the bill as passed by the house (for provisions see Digest 110) with the exception of House amendments

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 6, 1966
For actions of Oct. 5, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 169

CONTENTS

Animal research.....	34	Fish protein.....	15	Property.....	29
Appropriations.....	34,45	Flood insurance.....	32	Reclamation.....	28
Banking.....	42	Food for peace.....	1	Recreation.....	36,40
Bread prices.....	41	Food marketing.....	21	River basin.....	30
Budget.....	25	Foreign aid.....	14	Rural development.....	7
Child nutrition.....	2	4-H Clubs.....	22	School milk.....	20
Congressional.....		Inflation.....	25	Seeds.....	3
organization.....	18,44	Lands.....	37	Supplemental.....	
Conservation.....	28	Legislative record.....	23	appropriations.....	34
Consumers.....	9	Loans.....	11	Taxation.....	31
Credit.....	42	Manpower.....	17	Timber cutting.....	34
Demonstration cities.....	19	Mining.....	28	Tobacco.....	27
Education.....	5,12	Naval stores.....	43	Transportation.....	13
Experiment station.....	39	Personnel.....	10	Voting record.....	26
Farm credit.....	8	Political activity.....	35	Water resources.....	38
Farm program.....	6	Poverty.....	4,10,16,24	Wildlife.....	33

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to Conference report on child nutrition bill. House agreed to Senate amendments to bill revising Federal Seed Act. Rep. Langen criticized Administration's farm program.

HOUSE

1. **FOOD FOR PEACE.** Recommended, 306-61, to conference H. R. 14929, the food-for-peace bill, with instructions to insist on the provision restricting sales of agricultural commodities to any nation that ships equipment, materials, or commodities to Cuba or North Vietnam. pp. 24314-25
2. **CHILD NUTRITION.** Agreed to the conference report on S. 3467, the child nutrition bill. pp. 24313-4

3. SEEDS. Agreed to Senate amendments to H. R. 15662, to revise the Federal Seed Act. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 24313
4. POVERTY. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 15111, to continue and change various programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. p. 24326
5. EDUCATION. Began debate on H. R. 13161, to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools. pp. 24328-47, 24377-8
6. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Langen reviewed various criticisms of the Administration's farm program by the Republican Policy Committee. pp. 24365-6
7. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Rep. Moeller recommended S. 2934, the rural community development districts bill. pp. 24378-9
8. FARM CREDIT. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 153, to provide for medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Federal land bank system (H. Rept. 2193). p. 24387
9. CONSUMERS. Rep. Rosenthal reviewed and requested additional actions to protect consumers. pp. 24379-81
10. PERSONNEL; POVERTY. Rep. Bob Wilson claimed the administration is "hypocritical" in vetoing the Government employees' life insurance bill, then favoring the poverty bill. p. 24364

SENATE

11. LOANS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 688, to extend loan eligibility to non-profit corporations for rural renewal activities (S. Rept. 1676). p. 24184
12. EDUCATION. The Labor and Public Works Committee reported with amendments H. R. 14644, the proposed Higher Education Amendments of 1966 (S. Rept. 1677). p. 24184
Began debate on S. 3046, to strengthen and improve programs of assistance for elementary and secondary schools. pp. 24244, 24255-99
The Finance Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8664, to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, opened for signature at Lake Success on Nov. 22, 1950 (S. Rept. 1679). p. 24184
13. TRANSPORTATION. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 15963, to establish a Department of Transportation. House conferees have been appointed. p. 24244
14. FOREIGN AID. Passed, 52-22, with amendments H. R. 17788, the foreign aid appropriation bill (pp. 24224-244). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Ellender to reduce by \$27 million appropriations for development loans (pp. 24239-40). Conferees were appointed. House conferees have not been appointed.
15. FISH PROTEIN. Conferees were appointed on S. 2720, to authorize the Interior Department to develop practicable and economic means for production by the commercial fishing industry of fish protein concentrate. House conferees have not been appointed. pp. 24299-300

RURAL RENEWAL LOANS TO LOCAL NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

OCTOBER 5, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 688]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 688) to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill would amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to—

(1) permit the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with, and make rural renewal loans under that authority to, "local nonprofit organizations" (now restricted to public agencies); and

(2) include the development and protection of recreational facilities among the purposes of rural renewal programs.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

At present section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act provides for loans to State and local public agencies to carry out programs of land conservation and utilization. The area of jurisdiction of a public agency may not coincide with the area needing development. If the public agency's area is smaller, a comprehensive plan may not be worked out. If larger, the lack of interest in much of the political subdivision may defeat the needed development. In addition, the Department advises informally that some public agencies

(as in Florida) have been held not to have the authority to purchase and sell land deemed needed to carry out projects successfully.

Section 32(e) sets out a number of objectives for which development projects may be financed, such as protecting fish and wildlife, mitigating floods, and conserving moisture. The development of recreational facilities may be the best possible use of some of the land needing development, and the bill would therefore add that to the list of objectives.

SECURITY

The committee considered a number of alternative provisions to insure that adequate security would be required on loans to nonprofit local organizations which do not have taxing power. The committee did not wish, however, to make any change in the law which would affect its application to public bodies, without providing adequate notice and an opportunity for hearings. Consequently the various amendments considered were found deficient either because they created an inference that security was not to be required of public bodies, or because they added a general statutory requirement not now applicable to public bodies.

Although the act does not at present contain any explicit requirement that security be obtained for loans thereunder, existing FHA regulations require that rural renewal loans be secured in such manner, depending on the nature of the project and the statutory authority of the local public agency, as will protect the interest of the Government. They further require that security will usually be contract liens on property, tax or assessment liens, or project revenues pledged for repayment of the loan.

In connection with loans presently being made by FHA to associations, including corporations not operated for profit and public bodies, under section 306 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, FHA regulations similarly require security that will adequately protect the interest of the Government. This may be in the form of assignments of income or other assets, real or personal property mortgages, or pledges of taxes, assessments, or revenues derived from the operation of the project facility. Loans to nonprofit corporations which have been secured in the manner stated above have been highly successful. As of January 1, 1966, the FHA had advanced funds to 1,513 nonprofit corporations and public bodies in the total amount of \$173 million. More than 1,200 of these loans, including all of the early loans made prior to 1962 and a majority made since that time, were made to nonprofit corporations. The losses in principal as of January 1, 1966, on all of these 1,513 loans have been only \$9,188.

In view of this record the committee felt that application of the current rural renewal program regulations to nonprofit organizations not having the taxing power would provide adequate protection to the Government. The committee does not therefore recommend any amendment of the law in this respect, but it would expect that adequate security would be required of nonprofit organizations in the same manner as is now required of other eligible borrowers under the rural renewal program and as is required of nonprofit organizations for section 306 loans. It would further expect to be advised of any change in the regulations which might have the result of diminishing this protection.

The committee felt that wherever practicable loans to nonprofit organizations should be limited to cases where the borrower owns the land being developed. In this respect the committee had two objectives. First, the committee felt that this would help to provide adequate security and additional assurance of payment. Second, the committee wanted to avoid loans to nonprofit organizations that might result in windfall profits to the owners of the lands being developed. Section 31 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended by section 102 of Public Law 87-703, excludes private commercial enterprises from the objectives of the act. The nonprofit organization could not, therefore, obtain a loan to enable it to undertake an enterprise conducted for its own or a third party's profit.

The committee obtained the views of the Department of Agriculture on this matter in a letter from Howard Bertsch, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, which is attached hereto. The letter points out that while, as a general rule, the nonprofit organization should own the land, there may be a number of cases in which lesser interests would be satisfactory and would result in a savings in project funds. In the latter cases, and in all other cases where necessary to avoid windfall benefits, the committee felt that the loan should be conditioned upon contributions from the owners of any lands specially benefited, and that such contributions be commensurate with the special benefits accruing to the landowners. Contributions might be in the form of money, materials, services, reduced costs for use of the land during any period that the land is devoted to public use, or otherwise. It is expected that arrangements will vary from project to project but the objective should be to avoid the use of public funds to provide special benefits of a windfall nature.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendments are technical only, and make no change in the purpose of the bill. As introduced, the bill provided for insertion of "local nonprofit organizations" in (1) the enumeration of organizations eligible for planning assistance, and (2) the sentence providing for submission of plans to the appropriate State agency before a loan could be made. While the latter provided a clear inference that loans were to be made to local nonprofit organizations, the committee felt that that should be stated specifically. The committee amendments therefore provide for the insertion of "local nonprofit organizations" in the clause authorizing the Secretary to make loans. The committee amendments also omit a comma which is not deemed necessary.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

The Department of Agriculture recommended enactment of the bill with modifications which did not go to the subject matter of the bill, but rather to the basic provisions of the act. The Department's suggested modifications would—

(1) change the interest rate on rural renewal loans from the average rate paid by the Treasury on obligations in excess of 15 years to not less than—

(i) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average yield on U.S. obliga-

tions having maturities comparable to the average maturities of outstanding rural renewal loans, minus

(ii) not to exceed one percentum per annum; and

(2) strike out the third sentence of section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which requires approval resolutions by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees for any loan in excess of \$250,000.

Consistent with its feeling on proposed security amendments, the committee felt that no basic changes should be made in the program without notice and hearings, so that the committee and the Senate could be informed as to the views of interested parties and fully understand the effect of the changes. The committee did not therefore adopt the Department's proposals. The Department's report on this bill, together with the supplemental information supplied by Mr. Bertsch, follow:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1965.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request of January 27, 1965, for a report on S. 688, a bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes. S. 688 would amend section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010), by inserting "developing and protecting recreational facilities," immediately after "protecting fish and wildlife,". It would also amend section 32(e) of title III of such act by (1) inserting ", and local nonprofit organizations" immediately after "and other public agencies" in the first sentence thereof; and (2) inserting "and to local nonprofit organizations" immediately after "local public agencies" in the second sentence thereof.

This Department recommends the enactment of this legislation with the following modifications.

We recommend that the part of the fourth sentence of section 32(e) pertaining to the interest rate on loans to local organizations, i.e., "with interest at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury on its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which the loan is made, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue", be stricken and that the following be added in lieu thereof, "with interest at a rate not less than (i) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of one per centum, less (ii) not to exceed one per centum per annum."

The proposed modification in the interest rate provisions would result in a current minimum rate to rural renewal borrowers of 3.125 percent, slightly less than the current rate of 3.222 percent. It is possible that in future years the proposed formula could permit an

even lower minimum rate to borrowers than would be possible under the existing formula.

We also recommend that the third sentence of section 32(e) relating to loans in excess of \$250,000 be stricken. This provision makes legislative committees responsible for carrying out an executive function.

This bill would broaden the rural renewal authority to permit any corporation not operated for profit to participate in the planning and carrying out of a program of rural renewal. Throughout the Nation many nonprofit corporations and associations have been formed to cooperate with local rural areas development committees. These public spirited groups are not recognized as public agencies within the meaning of the term in the foregoing statute and, therefore, are not eligible for loans thereunder. Local public agencies do include village, county, district, and other municipal type bodies. One of the first difficulties such organizations encounter is that their area of jurisdiction is not and cannot be made to fit the area which needs rural renewal. Either the boundaries of the area under the jurisdiction of the public body embrace only a part of the economic or geographic area which should be renewed, or include areas larger than those which can feasibly be developed for rural renewal. In the latter case the lack of uniform local interest in the whole area deters or defeats the needed development. In order to carry out a coordinated program of land conservation and land utilization as an aid to the economic development or redevelopment of an area, the sponsoring and cooperating local organizations should have broader powers and more flexibility in methods than have been found generally in local public agencies created under existing State laws.

This bill would permit the rural renewal program to proceed without delay which otherwise might be encountered pending the enactment of appropriate State authorizing legislation for local public agencies.

The rural renewal program is designed to provide for greater and better utilization and conservation of the resources of the area with the result of improving the economy of the area and the income of rural people. The present authorization of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 enables local public groups to acquire lands and to perform certain development. However, it has been interpreted as falling short of providing one of the best possible uses of some land by the development of recreation facilities. In many areas, such facilities are needed to justify the basic resource development and to provide for their maximum beneficial use. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission recently reported an extreme shortage in recreational facilities generally and indicated that many of the additional facilities could only come from land presently owned by farmers. It has been estimated that by 1980 we would have 50 million acres of excess cropland that should be converted to other use. Funds for such recreational development and for technical assistance in connection therewith are usually not available to local groups on terms which would permit the proper kind of development. Under these amendments the local public agency or the local nonprofit organization could borrow needed funds to assist it in implementing the recreational portion of the total development plan.

In order to carry out a coordinated total program of land conservation and land utilization as an aid to the economic development or redevelopment of an area, the sponsoring and cooperating local

organizations should have broader powers and more flexibility in methods than have been found generally in local public agencies created under existing State laws. They should also have access to financing under this authorization for needed recreational development to assure proper land use and provide additional income for the area. S. 688 is necessary to permit this program to be moved forward without delay and make the maximum contribution to the overall economy of the area.

One of the basic concepts of the rural renewal program is the coordinating of planning, project development, and financing with related efforts of other agencies. This will continue to be a foremost requirement under the proposed amendments.

This bill will provide for more efficient and effective utilization of available funds and will not require additional appropriations.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. SCHNITTKER,
Under Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., October 3, 1966.

MR. HARKER STANTON,
Counsel, Agriculture and Forestry Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANTON: In response to your inquiry for information pertaining to Senate bill 688, we submit the following for your consideration:

With reference to landownership by nonprofit organizations, generally it would be desirable for nonprofit corporations and other nonprofit organizations to own the land on which developments are being made with rural renewal loan funds. Such ownership might exist prior to the loan or might be acquired with loan funds.

Whether or not landownership is necessary depends upon the type of project to be developed. There are situations where ownership of the land on which a project is to be developed is neither possible, desirable, nor practicable. For example, service type projects for the benefit of rural communities might be developed on public lands, such as those owned by Federal, State, county, or municipal governments or on lands of other parties. In such cases long-term use permits or lease arrangements should provide adequate use rights to enable the nonprofit organization to develop and carry out the project without incurring the additional cost of a land investment. Types of such projects are agriculture and forestry development, forestry products, utilization facilities, and forestation and reforestation, wildlife, hunting, and fishing areas, grazing units, conservation treatment areas, green belts, game preserves, grassland areas, and public use areas, recreation areas and facilities, community facilities, parks and public playgrounds, roads, lakes, streams, natural springs, and campsite developments.

There are many opportunities and needs for these kinds of developments in rural areas. A retirement that all nonprofit organizations

must acquire the land on which all developments are being made with rural renewal loan funds would prevent such organizations from planning, developing, and carrying out many service type projects urgently needed to bring parity of opportunity to rural areas.

With reference to rural renewal loan purposes, section 102 of Public Law 87-703 prohibits the use of rural renewal loans to build industrial parks or establish private industrial or commercial enterprises. This prohibition would be applicable to local nonprofit organizations. It is not inconsistent with and would not override nor prohibit the making of loans to public or nonprofit organizations to finance authorized activities, including those for recreational purposes conducted for the benefit of the public on a reasonable fee basis sufficient to pay operating, maintenance, and debt service costs. However, such loans could not be made to any corporation or other local nonprofit organization for the purpose of developing, establishing, or operating enterprises conducted for profit motives, or to construct or provide buildings or facilities to be sold to private individuals or corporations for carrying on commercial profitmaking activities.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD BERTSCH,
Administrator.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

* * * * *

SEC. 31. The Secretary is authorized and directed to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization, in order thereby to correct maladjustments in land use, and thus assist in controlling soil erosion, reforestation, preserving natural resources, protecting fish and wildlife, *developing and protecting recreational facilities*, mitigating floods, preventing impairment of dams and reservoirs, conserving surface and subsurface moisture, protecting the watersheds of navigable streams, and protecting the public lands, health, safety, and welfare, but not to build industrial parks or establish private industrial or commercial enterprises.

SEC. 32.

* * * * *

(e) to cooperate with Federal, State, territorial, and other public agencies *and local nonprofit organizations* in developing plans for a program of land conservation and land utilization, to assist in carrying out such plans by means of loans to State and local public agencies *and local nonprofit organizations* designated by the State legislature or the Governor, to conduct surveys and investigations relating to conditions and factors affecting, and the methods of accomplishing most effectively the purposes of this title, and to disseminate information concerning these activities. Loans to State and local public agencies *and to local nonprofit organizations* shall be made only if such plans have been submitted to, and not disapproved within 45 days by, the State

agency having supervisory responsibility over such plans, or by the Governor if there is no such State agency. No appropriation shall be made for any single loan under this subsection in excess of \$250,000 unless such loan has been approved by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives. Loans under this subsection shall be made under contracts which will provide under such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems appropriate, for the repayment thereof in not more than 30 years, with interest at the average rate, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, payable by the Treasury on its marketable public obligations outstanding at the beginning of the fiscal year in which the loan is made, which are neither due nor callable for redemption for 15 years from date of issue. Repayment of principal and interest on such loans shall begin within 5 years.

C

Calendar No. 1644

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 688

[Report No. 1676]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 26, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

OCTOBER 5, 1966

Reported by Mr. TALMADGE, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm
4 Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010), is amended by
5 inserting "developing and protecting recreational facilities,"
6 immediately after "protecting fish and wildlife,".

7 (b) Section 32 (e) of title III of such Act is amended
8 by—

9 (1) inserting "~~and~~ *and* local nonprofit organiza-

tions” immediately after “~~and other~~ public agencies”
each place it occurs in the first sentence thereof; and

(2) inserting “and to local nonprofit organizations”
 immediately after “local public agencies” in the second
 sentence thereof.

89TH CONGRESS
 2D SESSION

S. 688

Calendar No. 1644

[Report No. 1676]

A BILL

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones
 Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide
 for additional means and measures for land
 conservation and land utilization, and for
 other purposes.

By Mr. HOLLAND

JANUARY 26, 1965

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
 Agriculture and Forestry

OCTOBER 5, 1966

Reported with amendments

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 10, 1966
For actions of Oct. 7, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 171

CONTENTS

ACP assignments.....17	Foreign trade.....32	Naval stores.....12
Adjourned.....24	Guam.....10	Opinion poll.....30
Appropriations.....2	Hay.....34	Organization.....33
CCC.....34	Hemisfair.....13	Renewal loans.....1
Commission.....33	Inflation.....22	Rural development.....28
Conservation.....16	Lands.....4,31	Senior citizens.....26
Disaster relief.....34	Legislative.....	Tariff.....14
Education.....3,11	accomplishments....20,27	Water pollution.....6
Electrification.....21	Legislative program....23	Water resources.....5
Fish-wildlife.....7	Livestock.....29,34	Watersheds.....18
Foreign agricultural.....	Loans.....1	Wildlife.....7,19
service.....9	Milk.....8	Wool imports.....25
Foreign currencies.....15	Mining.....31	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to authorize rural renewal loans to non-profit organizations and for recreation. House committee reported bill to repeal Naval Stores Act. Both Houses agreed to conference report on foreign aid appropriation bill. House passed bill providing adjustment of Defense milk contracts when USDA orders prices raised. Sen. Mondale introduced and discussed bill to establish Executive Organization Review Commission. Sen. McCarthy introduced and discussed bill to authorize CCC purchase of hay for livestock in disaster areas.

SENATE

1. RURAL RENEWAL LOANS. Passed as reported S. 688, to permit rural renewal loans to local non-profit organizations in addition to public agencies, and to permit such loans to be made for recreational facilities. pp. 24696-7
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 61-4, as reported H. R. 17787, the public works appropriation bill. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 24736-68

Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 17788, the foreign aid appropriation bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 24771-4, 24606-10

The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 17637, the military construction appropriation bill (S. Rept. 1695). p. 24690

3. EDUCATION. Passed with amendment H. R. 13161, to strengthen and improve programs of assistance to elementary and secondary schools. S. 3046, which had been passed by the Senate, was indefinitely postponed. Senate conferees were appointed. House conferees have not been appointed. pp. 24812-13

Began debate on H. R. 14644, to extend and amend the Higher Education Facilities Act. pp. 24768-771, 24783-821, 24823

4. LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 84, to provide reimbursement to Wyo. for improvements on certain Eden project lands if such lands revert to the U. S. (S. Rept. 1699). p. 24691

5. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Yarborough spoke on the possibility of redistributing surplus Canadian water to the arid Southwest. pp. 24713-4

6. WATER POLLUTION. Sen. Kennedy, Mass., inserted articles favoring additional water pollution control. pp. 24727-32

7. FISH-WILDLIFE. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9424, to provide for conservation and protection of endangered species of fish and wildlife. pp. 24782-3

HOUSE

8. MILK. Passed without amendment S. 3834, to provide for price adjustments in contracts for procurement of milk by the Defense Department when prices go up after USDA determinations. This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar bill, H. R. 17500, was tabled. pp. 24610-11

9. FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE. Received from the Government Operations Committee a report, "Market Promotion Activity of Foreign Agricultural Service" (H. Rept. 2206). p. 24689

10. GUAM. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 2979, to extend coverage of the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to Guam (H. Rept. 2208). p. 24689

11. EDUCATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment H. R. 13884, the proposed Professional Training and Cooperation Amendments (H. Rept. 2209). p. 24689

12. NAVAL STORES. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7381, to repeal the Naval Stores Act (H. Rept. 2210). p. 24689

13. HEMISFAIR. Concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 15098, relating to U. S. participation in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held in San Antonio, Tex. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 24605-6

sharply reduced. It will be helpful to the operation of the farm program for the Secretary to be able to designate hay as well as feed grains to meet emergency situations.

Under present provisions of section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 the Commodity Credit Corporation may make available any farm commodity it owns or controls to relieve distress, in accord with terms set by the Secretary, in connection with major disasters determined by the President to warrant assistance under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, and in areas declared by the President to be distress areas because of unemployment or other economic causes. Under the authority of this section feed grains have been donated to designated agencies for distribution in disaster area.

Section 407 also directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to make feed available at not less than 75 percent of the current basic support rate for assistance in preserving and maintaining foundation herds in areas of flood, drought, or other catastrophe, when the Secretary determines there is an emergency which warrants assistance.

In addition, under the act of 1959, as amended, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to sell, at not less than the current county support rate, feed grains which it owns in order to provide feed for livestock in any area determined by the Secretary to be an emergency area, provided the Governor of the State has previously determined the need for such assistance.

Thus, under the authority of existing law, donations of feed grains can be and have been made for feeding livestock in disaster areas; also, sales of feed grains have been made at 75 percent of support price for assistance in maintaining foundation herds and sales have been made at the support price for feeding other livestock in emergency areas.

The problem is that assistance in providing feed under existing law is limited to the commodities owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Since there is no price support for hay, the CCC does not acquire hay and has none for distribution.

It is true that under Public Law 875, 81st Congress, the President may direct Federal agencies to provide assistance in major disaster areas by utilizing or lending, with or without compensation, their equipment, supplies, facilities, personnel, and other resources to States and local governments, if the President determines the disaster of sufficient severity and if the Governor of the State certifies the need for assistance and assures expenditures of a reasonable amount of local funds for the purpose. This authority has been delegated in general to the Office of Emergency Planning, which may direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase hay to relieve distress in disaster areas. So while there is legal authority for the CCC to purchase hay under these circumstances, it is limited to directions by the Office of Emergency Planning and by funds made available for such purpose under Public Law 875.

Under terms of the bill I am introducing today the CCC would be authorized to purchase hay and make it available as it now makes feed available under section 407 and the act of 1959 for disaster and other emergency livestock feeding.

The proposed bill would also authorize the Secretary to make cost assistance payments with respect to hay purchased for use under conditions similar to those described in existing statutory authority with respect to disaster and emergency areas. The bill provides that such payments may not exceed one-fourth of the price determined by the Secretary to be the normal price for hay in such areas and such portion of the increased transportation costs necessary to bring supplies of hay from more distant areas outside the normal supply in the disaster area. The purpose of this provision, of course, is to avoid an undue increase in the price of hay in the local emergency area and to encourage transportation of hay from reasonably distant hay surplus areas. The penalty provisions under section 407 and the act of 1959 would also be applicable to distribution of hay as provided in the bill.

There was a severe drought in many sections of Minnesota in 1964. This year several Eastern and Southern States have experienced a similar drought. Other disasters occur from time to time. The Secretary should have the authority to move quickly in time of catastrophe and when the need arises to provide hay as well as feed grains to avert further disaster. This bill would greatly improve the disaster assistance program and provide needed procedures to prevent further losses in herds at a time of catastrophe.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3894) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase hay and make it available for use in feeding livestock in disaster and other emergency areas, and to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make cost assistance payments to livestockmen on hay purchased to feed livestock in areas affected by catastrophes, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HIGHER EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1966—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 956

Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. METCALF, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 14644) to amend the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 to extend it for 3 years, and other purposes; and to authorize assistance to developing institutions for an additional year, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 957

Mr. MORSE proposed amendments to House bill 14644, supra, which were ordered to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when proposed by Mr. MORSE, which appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 958

Mr. SCOTT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 14644, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor to the bill (S. 3865) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rates of duty on certain fabrics containing wool and silk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CONTESTED POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, I wish to announce that public hearings have been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Contested Nominations of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to hear testimony on postmaster nominations to be held in room 6202 of the New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m., Tuesday, October 11, 1966.

The subcommittee will hear testimony on postmaster nominations for the following post offices:

New Province, Pa.
Riverside, N.J.
Corfu, N.Y.
Ashland, Ky.
Riverton, Wyo.
Eagle Nest, N. Mex.
Oconto Falls, Wis.
Vermontville, Mich.

Any person wishing to testify on these nominations may arrange to do so by calling the committee office, telephone 225-5451.

RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES E. NOLAND, OF INDIANA, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

Mr. BAYH. Madam President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing originally scheduled for Thursday, October 13, 1966, on the nomination of James E. Noland, of Indiana, to be U.S. district judge, southern district of Indiana, to fill a new position created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966, has been rescheduled for Wednesday, October 12, 1966, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BAYH. Madam President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edwin L. Miller, Jr., of California, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of California, term of 4 years, to fill a new position to become effective September 18, 1966, created by Public Law 89-372, approved March 18, 1966.

On behalf of the Committee of the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, October 14, 1966, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Ellsworth Bunker, of Vermont, to be Ambassador at Large; Llewellyn E. Thompson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and, Maj. Gen. John J. Davis, U.S. Army, of Kansas, to be an Assistant Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, with the rank of lieutenant general.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

The same statement applies to the nomination of Sol M. Linowitz, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Council of the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador, which was received by the Senate late on yesterday, October 6, 1966.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, October 7, 1966, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1607. An act to amend the act of September 13, 1962, authorizing the establishment of the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes; and

S. 3467. An act to strengthen and expand food service programs for children.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Vice Adm. Rufus L. Taylor, U.S. Navy, to be Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gen. Hunter Harris, Jr., FR624—major general Regular Air Force—U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code, to be a general.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army. Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE III OF THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1644, S. 688.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 688) to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "inserting", to strike out "and" and insert "and"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "after", to strike out "and other"; and, at the beginning of line 2, to insert "each place it occurs"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010), is amended by inserting "developing and protecting recreational facilities," immediately after "protecting fish and wildlife,".

(b) Section 32(e) of title III of such Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "and local nonprofit organizations" immediately after "public agencies" each place it occurs in the first sentence thereof; and

(2) inserting "and to local nonprofit organizations" immediately after "local public agencies" in the second sentence thereof.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, they are agreed to en bloc.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1676), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill would amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to—

(1) permit the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with, and make rural renewal loans under that authority to, "local nonprofit organizations" (now restricted to public agencies); and

(2) include the development and protection of recreational facilities among the purposes of rural renewal programs.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

At present section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act provides for loans to State and local public agencies to carry out programs of land conservation and utilization. The area of jurisdiction of a public agency may not coincide with the area needing development. If the public agency's area is smaller, a comprehensive plan may not be worked out. If larger, the lack of interest in much of the political subdivision may defeat the needed development. In addition, the Department advises informally that some public agencies (as in Florida) have been held not to have the authority to purchase and sell land deemed needed to carry out projects successfully.

Section 32(e) sets out a number of objectives for which development projects may be financed, such as protecting fish and wildlife, mitigating floods, and conserving moisture. The development of recreational facilities may be the best possible use of some of the land needing development, and

the bill would therefore add that to the list of objectives.

SECURITY

The committee considered a number of alternative provisions to insure that adequate security would be required on loans to nonprofit local organizations which do not have taxing power. The committee did not wish, however, to make any change in the law which would affect its application to public bodies, without providing adequate notice and an opportunity for hearings. Consequently the various amendments considered were found deficient either because they created an inference that security was not to be required of public bodies, or because they added a general statutory requirement not now applicable to public bodies.

Although the act does not at present contain any explicit requirement that security be obtained for loans thereunder, existing FHA regulations require that rural renewal loans be secured in such manner, depending on the nature of the project and the statutory authority of the local public agency, as will protect the interest of the Government. They further require that security will usually be contract liens on property, tax or assessment liens, or project revenues pledged for repayment of the loan.

In connection with loans presently being made by FHA to associations, including corporations not operated for profit and public bodies, under section 306 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, FHA regulations similarly require security that will adequately protect the interest of the Government. This may be in the form of assignments of income or other assets, real or personal property mortgages, or pledges of taxes, assessments, or revenues derived from the operation of the project facility. Loans to nonprofit corporations which have been secured in the manner stated above have been highly successful. As of January 1, 1966, the FHA had advanced funds to 1,513 nonprofit corporations and public bodies in the total amount of \$173 million. More than 1,200 of these loans, including all of the early loans made prior to 1962 and a majority made since that time, were made to nonprofit corporations. The losses in principal as of January 1, 1966, on all of these 1,513 loans have been only \$9,188.

In view of this record the committee felt that application of the current rural renewal program regulations to nonprofit organizations not having the taxing power would provide adequate protection to the Government. The committee does not therefore recommend any amendment of the law in this respect, but it would expect that adequate security would be required of nonprofit organizations in the same manner as is now required of other eligible borrowers under the rural renewal program and as is required of nonprofit organizations for section 306 loans. It would further expect to be advised of any change in the regulations which might have the result of diminishing this protection.

The committee felt that wherever practicable loans to nonprofit organizations should be limited to cases where the borrower owns the land being developed. In this respect the committee had two objectives. First, the committee felt that this would help to provide adequate security and additional assurance of payment. Second, the committee wanted to avoid loans to nonprofit organizations that might result in windfall profits to the owners of the lands being developed. Section 31 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended by section 102 of Public Law 87-703, excludes private commercial enterprises from the objectives of the act. The nonprofit organization could not, therefore, obtain a loan to enable it to undertake

an enterprise conducted for its own or a third party's profit.

The committee obtained the views of the Department of Agriculture on this matter in a letter from Howard Bertsch, Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration, which is attached hereto. The letter points out that while, as a general rule, the nonprofit organization should own the land, there may be a number of cases in which lesser interests would be satisfactory and would result in a savings in project funds. In the latter cases, and in all other cases where necessary to avoid windfall benefits, the committee felt that the loan should be conditioned upon contributions from the owners of any lands specially benefited, and that such contributions be commensurate with the special benefits accruing to the landowners. Contributions might be in the form of money, materials, services, reduced costs for use of the land during any period that the land is devoted to public use, or otherwise. It is expected that arrangements will vary from project to project but the objective should be to avoid the use of public funds to provide special benefits of a windfall nature.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee amendments are technical only, and make no change in the purpose of the bill. As introduced, the bill provided for insertion of "local nonprofit organizations" in (1) the enumeration of organizations eligible for planning assistance, and (2) the sentence providing for submission of plans to the appropriate State agency before a loan could be made. While the latter provided a clear inference that loans were to be made to local nonprofit organizations, the committee felt that that should be stated specifically. The committee amendments therefore provide for the insertion of "local nonprofit organizations" in the clause authorizing the Secretary to make loans. The committee amendments also omit a comma which is not deemed necessary.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

The Department of Agriculture recommended enactment of the bill with modifications which did not go to the subject matter of the bill, but rather to the basic provisions of the act. The Department's suggested modifications would—

(1) change the interest rate on rural renewal loans from the average rate paid by the Treasury on obligations in excess of 15 years to not less than—

(i) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the average yield on U.S. obligations having maturities comparable to the average maturities of outstanding rural renewal loans, minus

(ii) not to exceed one percentum per annum; and

(2) strike out the third sentence of section 32(e) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which requires approval resolutions by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees for any loan in excess of \$250,000.

Consistent with its feeling on proposed security amendments, the committee felt that no basic changes should be made in the program without notice and hearings, so that the committee and the Senate could be informed as to the views of interested parties and fully understand the effect of the changes. The committee did not therefore adopt the Department's proposals.

EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL MATERIALS IMPORTATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1646, H.R. 8664.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8664) to implement the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials opened for signature at Lake Success on November 22, 1950, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 1678) explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. PURPOSE

H.R. 8664 implements the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials, commonly referred to as the Florence agreement.

The Florence agreement is an international agreement, sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which was opened for signature on November 22, 1950. The agreement is designed to facilitate the free flow of educational, scientific, and cultural materials by the removal of barriers that impede the international movement of such materials.

The agreement provides for the accomplishment of its purposes through provision for the duty-free importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials. H.R. 8664 would permit, with certain procedural safeguards, the duty-free treatment envisaged by the agreement to the extent that the materials provided for therein are not already free of duty under the existing provisions of the schedules.

II. GENERAL STATEMENT

A. Background

The Florence agreement is an international agreement sponsored by UNESCO. It was opened for signature on November 22, 1950, and entered into force on May 21, 1952. To date 50 countries have become parties thereto (see app. B).

The United States signed the agreement on June 24, 1959, and the Senate gave advice and consent to ratification on February 23, 1960. Deposit of the U.S. ratification, however, has been delayed pending enactment of the necessary implementing legislation, and, accordingly, the United States is presently not one of the 50 countries referred to above. H.R. 8664 provides the implementing legislation necessary to the United States becoming a party to the agreement.

B. Summary of the Florence agreement

The preamble of the Florence agreement states that "the free exchange of ideas and knowledge and, in general, the widest possible dissemination of the diverse forms of self-expression used by civilizations are vitally important both for intellectual progress and international understanding, and consequently for the maintenance of world peace," and that "these aims will be effectively furthered by an international agreement facilitating the free flow of books, publications, and educational, scientific, and cultural materials."

The principal substantive portions of the Florence agreement, the English text of

which is reproduced in full in the appendix to this report, provide that the parties thereto shall accord to the products of the other parties duty-free treatment for those types of educational, scientific, and cultural materials which are described in articles I and III and in the five annexes to the agreement.

Article II contains some limitations upon the application of import restrictions and exchange controls imposed for balance-of-payments reasons to certain types of educational and cultural materials.

Article IV of the agreement, in general language, provides that the parties will, as far as possible, continue efforts "to promote by every means the free circulation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials," to abolish or reduce any restrictions thereto, and to "simplify administrative procedure" governing their importation.

The agreement permits the parties thereto to continue internal taxes which do not discriminate against imported articles (art. I:2(a)), and to take measures to prohibit or limit the importation or internal distribution of materials to which it relates on grounds of national security, public order, or public morals (art. V). It also provides that it shall not affect laws and regulations relating to copyright, trademarks, or patents (art. VI).

Subject to previous commitments between the parties, disputes regarding the interpretation or application of the agreement are to be settled by negotiation or conciliation (art. VII), and provision is made for referring disputes to the Director General of UNESCO for an advisory opinion (art. VIII).

Among its procedural provisions, the agreement provides that a country signing after the agreement entered into force, as the United States did, shall take the internal measures necessary to make the agreement effective within 3 months after the deposit of its instrument of ratification (art. XII:2).

The agreement also provides that soon after a country becomes a party it shall report to UNESCO on its implementation and that UNESCO will communicate such reports to the other parties (art. XII: 3 and 4). Your committee notes that the material now available through this channel on the implementation of the agreement by the parties does not appear in all cases to be current. It is understood that UNESCO may convene a meeting of the parties to the Florence agreement within the next year or so to consider the operation of the agreement. It would be desirable for the U.S. representatives at such meeting to seek an improvement of the reporting procedures to provide the parties with more up-to-date information on the implementation by other parties.

C. Need for the bill

In a letter of June 1, 1965, to the Speaker of the House, the President reiterated and emphasized the purpose of the agreement as being the enhancement "of international understanding by reducing trade barriers to the flow of knowledge in all directions across all frontiers." He further stated that enactment of implementing legislation would be of very material benefit to our schools and universities, science laboratories and research foundations, libraries, art galleries, and museums. The President requested expeditious action by the Congress to approve such legislation, stating that the "fullest freedom of access to the knowledge and culture of other nations is the hallmark of the open society."

On November 8, 1965, the President issued a statement pointing out the need for passage of the bill in the interest of "economy of effort." He had just signed 14 individual bills providing free entry for specific scientific instruments imported for use in universities through the country. He indicated that had the implementing legislation for the Florence agreement been enacted

these separate bills would have been unnecessary.

More recently in his message to Congress urging passage of the International Education and Health Acts of 1966, the President stated:

"I recommend prompt passage of legislation to implement the Florence agreement that thus stimulate the movement of books and other educational material between nations. This agreement was signed by representatives of the U.S. Government in 1959 and ratified by the Senate in 1960. The necessary congressional action is long overdue to eliminate duties and remove barriers for the importation of educational materials."

H.R. 8664 would provide such duty-free treatment as is envisaged by the agreement to the extent that the materials provided therein are not already free of duty under existing law. In this connection, many of the articles for which duty-free treatment is provided in the agreement are presently duty free under the tariff schedules. Examples are books in foreign languages, most periodicals, original paintings, original sculpture, certain antiques, certain audiovisual materials imported by educational institutions, articles for the blind, and articles for specified exhibitions.

The aim of this legislation is the furtherance of the educational, scientific, and cultural purposes contemplated in the Florence agreement, as distinguished from the economic purposes for which the Congress has authorized the President to negotiate trade agreements. Enactment of H.R. 8664 would in no way be intended to replace, supplant, or enlarge upon the reciprocal trade agreements program. The objective and goal of this legislation is as stated above, furtherance of arts and sciences, not tariff bargaining for economic ends. These two programs are separate and distinct. On the one hand is the very limited program of implementing the exchange of educational, scientific, and cultural materials contemplated by the Florence agreement, which would be provided for in H.R. 8664, as distinguished from the trade agreements program which is directed toward the negotiation of reciprocal reduction of duties to achieve economic objectives. The two programs are distinct both in purpose and in operation.

D. Trade effect

Although, as has been pointed out, the purposes of the Florence agreement and of H.R. 8664 are educational, scientific, and cultural rather than economic and commercial, your committee has given attention to the trade implications of the bill.

Assistant Secretary of State Frankel estimated that imports in 1965 of articles which are to be made duty free by the bill amounted to roughly \$39 million, with revenue to the Treasury of about \$1.75 million. The views were expressed by him that passage of the bill "will not result in any significant increase in the level of imports," and that, because of such minimal trade impact, it was not expected that the bill would "have any significant adverse effect on the U.S. balance of payments."

III. SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

A. Section 1. Short title, et cetera

The first section of H.R. 8664, provides a short title for this legislation, the "Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966." It also states the purposes of the bill, which is the implementation of the Florence agreement with a view to contributing to world peace through the freer exchange of ideas and knowledge across national boundaries.

B. Section 2. Effective date

This section provides that the amendments made by the bill shall be effective on a date to be proclaimed by the President.

This date is to be within 3 months after deposit of the instrument of ratification with the United Nations. This provision is designed to permit the President to correlate their effective date with the assumption by the United States of obligations under the Florence agreement.

C. Section 3. Books, pamphlets, and other printed and manuscript material

Section 3 would provide duty-free treatment for such books and pamphlets as are not duty free, except catalogs relating to the sale of U.S. products. The principal articles which would be made free of duty are books in the English language, picture books, toy books, current lithographic, and certain other periodicals, and printed matter suitable for the production of books which would themselves be duty free. Newspapers, many other periodicals, and most other books are already free of duty.

Maps, atlases, and charts would be made duty free, as would music regardless of its age. The present exemption from duty for tourist literature would be slightly broadened.

D. Section 4. Works of art; antiques

Section 4 would expand the present duty-free treatment of original paintings, pastels, drawings, and sketches executed by hand, to include such articles which are not originals. Certain original sculpture, and prints printed by hand, are currently afforded duty-free treatment.

This section would also change the test for determining antiques entitled to duty-free treatment from those made prior to 1830 (or earlier dates in the case of a few specified articles) to those made more than 100 years prior to their entry.

E. Section 5. Documents of foreign governments and international organizations

Section 5 would broaden slightly the present provision for the duty-free entry of publications of foreign governments and international organizations, most of which are presently already duty free under item 840.00 of the tariff schedules.

F. Section 6. Certain articles imported by educational, scientific, and other specified institutions

Subsections (a) and (b) of section 6 would expand somewhat the present provisions for the duty-free importation by public and other nonprofit educational, scientific, and comparable institutions, of audiovisual materials, patterns, and models.

Subsection (c) of section 6 would provide for the duty-free entry of instruments and apparatus for use by public and other nonprofit educational or scientific institutions under specified circumstances. In order to be eligible for such treatment the instruments or apparatus must be otherwise classifiable under specified portions of the tariff schedules, must be for use by the institution for noncommercial purposes. Most importantly, duty-free entry would be dependent upon a finding by the Secretary of Commerce, which would be subject to judicial review, that no instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value for the purposes for which it is intended to be used is being manufactured in the United States. Provision is also made for duty-free entry for repair components for instruments and apparatus so admitted.

Section 6(c)(4) of the bill would repeal the present provision regarding electron microscopes and make the duty-free treatment of such microscopes subject to these tests.

G. Section 7. Scientific specimens

Section 7 would expand somewhat the present provisions for duty-free treatment of scientific specimens by specifying some additional fields to which specimens entitled to such treatment may relate and by making

89TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 688

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 10, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AN ACT

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm
4 Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010), is amended by
5 inserting "developing and protecting recreational facilities,"
6 immediately after "protecting fish and wildlife,".

7 (b) Section 32 (e) of title III of such Act is amended
8 by—

9 (1) inserting "and local nonprofit organizations"

1 immediately after "public agencies" each place it occurs
2 in the first sentence thereof; and

3 (2) inserting "and to local nonprofit organizations"
4 immediately after "local public agencies" in the second
5 sentence thereof.

Passed the Senate October 7, 1966.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

OCTOBER 10, 1966

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued Oct. 18, 1966
For actions of Oct. 17, 1966
89th-2nd; No. 178

CONTENTS

ACP.....9	Foreign trade.....19	Rural housing.....27
Airports.....7	Health services.....18	Rural-renewal loans.....2
Appropriations.....6,21,27	Historic sites.....37	School lunch.....21
Cities.....26	Labeling.....3	Seed.....40
Congressional.....	Lands.....8,16	Summer lunches.....1
accomplishments....29,30	Legislative powers.....25	Supplemental.....
Congressional.....	Loans.....2,26	appropriations.....6,21
reorganization.....22	Military construction...27	Taxation.....15
Conservation.....9,10	Packaging.....2	Transportation.....39
Dairy.....23	Personnel.....20,24,35	Veterinary education.....5
Disaster relief.....13,33	Political activity.....20	Wage-price controls.....30
Education.....5	Poverty.....4	Water pollution.....17
Farm program.....32	Reclamation.....34	Watersheds.....14
Fish protein.....12	Recreation.....2,36	Wildlife.....38
Food prices.....28	Rivers.....16	World Farm Center.....11

HIGHLIGHTS: see page 5

HOUSE

1. SUMMER LUNCHES. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 9339, to authorize a children's summer lunch program. pp. 26032-7
2. RURAL-RENEWAL LOANS. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 688, to authorize rural-renewal loans for recreation purposes and for private non-profit organizations. pp. 26046-7

3. PACKAGING; LABELING. Agreed to the conference report on S. 985, the fair packaging and labeling bill. pp. 26062-4
4. POVERTY. Received the conference report on H. R. 15111, to continue and amend various programs under the Economic Opportunity Act (H. Rept. 2298). pp. 26050-61
5. VETERINARY EDUCATION. Concurred in a Senate amendment to H. R. 3348, to authorize construction of facilities for teaching veterinary medicine and loans for students of veterinary medicine, and disagreed to two Senate amendments. pp. 26065-6
6. APPROPRIATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution to waive points of order on H. R. 18381, the supplemental appropriation bill. p. 26144
Received the conference report on H. R. 17636, the D. C. appropriation bill (H. Rept. 2292). pp. 26010-12
Conferees were appointed on H. R. 18119, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. 26032
7. AIRPORTS. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 476, providing for construction of airports in or close to national parks, monuments, and recreation areas. Rep. Staggers said this bill is identical to H. R. 11089. The bill will now be sent to the President. p. 26038
8. LANDS. Passed without amendment S. 84, to provide for reimbursement of Wyo. for improvements made on certain Eden project lands in Sweetwater County if or when the lands revert to the U. S. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 26000
9. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM. Passed as reported H. R. 17588, to authorize assignments of ACP payments. pp. 26006-7
10. CONSERVATION. After discussion, H. R. 15304, to authorize the Department to sell the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center in Alameda County, Calif., was passed over because the official objectors felt it should not be considered by unanimous-consent procedure. pp. 26007-8
11. WORLD FARM CENTER. After discussion, H. Con. Res. 313, to endorse the concept of the World Farm Center, was passed over at the request of Rep. Pelly. p. 26008
12. FISH PROTEIN. Received the conference report on S. 2720, to authorize the Interior Department to develop practicable and economic means for the production of fish protein concentrate (H. Rept. 2290). pp. 26012-3
13. DISASTER RELIEF. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 1861, to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster. pp. 26024-32
14. WATERSHEDS. Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau plans for various watershed projects. pp. 26144, 26146-7
15. TAXATION. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 17607, to suspend the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property (p. 25999). Senate conferees have already been appointed.

especially vacation privileges—available to the Government's seafaring employees. Since the pay of such Government employees is based on practices in the maritime industry, it is the fringe benefits which constitute the real problem.

The leave benefits for Government maritime employees, which are the same as they are for all other Government employees, are substantially less favorable than leave benefits of crewmen in the maritime industry. The Civil Service Commission survey stresses this disparity in leave benefits as a principal cause of the Government's difficulty in the efficient manning of oceangoing vessels.

Enactment of H.R. 18217 will materially improve the Government's competitive position. The bill authorizes home leave for personnel who serve on oceangoing vessels on extended voyages, at the rate of not over 2 days' leave for each 30 calendar days of such service. This home leave will be added to their regular annual leave and will accumulate for future use. It cannot be used for lump-sum payment upon separation, but can be granted as terminal leave under such special or emergency circumstances as are provided for by civil service regulations.

Mr. Speaker, the record would not be complete if it did not show that this legislation is largely a tribute to the vice chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]. He sponsored the original bill on the subject, and has vigorously supported our subcommittee in the development of H.R. 18217. This exemplifies his dedication to the strengthening of the Federal civil service and to giving fair and equitable treatment to all Government employees.

I hope that the House will give overwhelming approval to this needed legislation.

Recently I read a letter written by Chairman John Macy of the Civil Service Commission to Chairman MURRAY of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The letter was written on August 11, 1966, and here is a very clear and significant sentence in it:

The findings clearly show that the Government is having serious difficulty staffing many of its ocean-going marine positions. The rate of turnover is high, and replacements are hard to find in a generally tight labor market. A substantial lag behind industry in vacation benefits places the Government at a disadvantage in recruiting from the limited manpower resources available.

In substance, this is the basic reason for H.R. 18217. A seaman, who works for the Federal Government, today has the same amount of leave that any other Government employee has; but that does not compare favorably with what a seaman who works for the private maritime industry gets in the way of leave.

I emphasize that this bill would cost about \$4.3 million annually. It has the approval of all the divisions of our Government that are concerned. It is felt that it is very necessary at this time.

I might say that our very able colleague, Representative JIMMIE MORRISON,

has done a great deal of work on this legislation, as has the very distinguished gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA]. Both have been very effective and constructive in their efforts to make this legislation good legislation. It was passed unanimously by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. As I understand the situation, it definitely will be considered by the Senate, if it is passed here, because it is badly needed.

I do hope that the membership of the House will see fit to pass it.

Roughly, the average Government employee gets anywhere from 13 to 26 days leave at this time. This bill would give the seagoing employee of the Government about 20 additional days on an average annually, which would bring him up to that which the average person who is a seaman for private industry gets.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Is the leave accumulated based on trip and time away from port of embarkation to port of debarkation?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is correct. Actually, it would provide an average of 2 days' leave for each month that he is at sea. It would accumulate in that fashion. It is designed, in effect, to give him an opportunity to have on an average of about 20 additional days of leave a year in addition to what he now has, which is about what private industry gives him, and which causes him to be in many instances more interested in going to private industry at this time.

The Navy Department is interested in this; the Department of the Army is interested; the Commerce Department is interested; the Department of the Interior is interested. It is my impression that the Panama Canal Company is also interested in this proposed legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. If the gentleman will yield further, it is clearly stipulated that there will be no lump-sum payment in lieu of leave at any one time on the basis of separation? Is that not true, plus avoiding jumping ship between each employment?

Mr. BECKWORTH. That is my understanding, yes.

Mr. HALL. Is there any money in this additional \$4.3 million per annum to handle the additional leave with pay which would pay expenses or give transportation requests from the point of debarkation to the point designated for leave, or would that be borne by the deck officer or the electronics officer or the chief petty officer?

Mr. BECKWORTH. It is my impression that the seafaring employee would have to get to the place from which he is to sail.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. In behalf of the minority, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the

gentleman from Texas and urge the adoption of this bill.

I might say that I happen to be, by choice of our ranking minority Member, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which handled this. It has been my great pleasure to work with the gentleman from Texas on this subcommittee.

I wish to say for the RECORD that the gentleman from Texas has done an outstanding job and has been a great credit to this House, to the Congress, and to his district. He will be sorely missed on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I wish to bid him well and to thank him for a job well done.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I surely appreciate the kind words of the very able and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JOHNSON]. I can certainly return them manifold in respect to the fine work our colleague from Pennsylvania has done as the ranking minority member of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Representative JOHNSON is always on the job; he attended our meetings regularly and never fails to be most helpful and constructive in his suggestions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As a member of the full committee, I certainly wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania concerning the gentleman from Texas, who is a distinguished Member of this House, and has been a valuable and leading member of the committee, rendering outstanding service as a subcommittee chairman.

I also join in support of this legislation. It is reasonably certain that anything John Macy and the Civil Service Commission recommend is both sound and conservative. This seems to be a definite step toward comparability for seafaring personnel. At a time when the Vietnamese conflict is requiring more shipping, we need this to attract an adequate number of seafaring personnel to Federal service.

I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this bill before the House.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I surely appreciate what the gentleman has said. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] is a very valuable member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and at all times does an excellent job of work because he is a real student of legislation. He consistently attends the sessions of our committee. Indeed, his many, many constructive contributions are appreciated by all the Democrats and Republicans of our committee.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES H. MORRISON IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 18217, OCTOBER 17, 1966

Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate the generous comments of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. BECKWORTH—the very able Chairman of our Civil Service Subcommittee—about my work on this legislation.

As the gentleman has indicated, the problem of an adequate leave system for the Government's maritime employees first engaged my attention several years ago, and it was my privilege to introduce H.R. 3002, to correct the situation, early in this Congress.

I became deeply concerned after my conversations with representatives of the AFL-CIO Government Employees Council, the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, and the National Maritime Union, disclosed employment conditions that are adverse to the interests of both the Government and its seafaring employees. My further inquiries into official Government records, and discussions with responsible Federal authorities, confirmed my conclusion that prompt legislative relief is imperative.

Although H.R. 18217 represents a modification of the policies of my bill, H.R. 3002, in view of the overruling matters of public necessity I believe it will provide the immediate relief needed, and I strongly recommend enactment of H.R. 18217.

By way of background, the present unfortunate circumstances stem from misunderstanding of certain language in the Classification Act of 1949. That Act in effect lays down the principles for fixing the pay of seamen employed by the Government. This is done by excluding these seamen from the salary schedules of the Act and then providing that their "compensation shall be fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates and practices in the maritime industry * * *."

The misunderstanding relates to the words "practices in the maritime industry." This language was intended to give Government seafaring employees both pay and benefits reasonably comparable to those in private enterprise, subject to requirements of the public interest. It also was designed to prevent the Government from adversely affecting labor conditions in the maritime industry. Among the benefits I believe were meant to be considered was the leave or vacation privilege. However, when the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 was passed, spelling out the numbers of days of leave to which Government employees are entitled and the periods of service which control, it did not contain a specific exclusion with respect to the leave rights of seamen—as had been done with respect to their pay in the Classification Act 2 years earlier.

Early in 1964 the Department of the Navy submitted the question of seamen's leave for decision by the Comptroller General, because of difficulties even then faced by the Military Sea Transportation Service in recruiting and retaining qualified crews for its vessels. The specific question submitted was whether or not MSTs seamen might, by administrative action, be granted leave benefits in accordance with the prevailing practice of the maritime industry, rather than in accordance with the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951.

The Comptroller General, in a decision of April 3, 1964 (B-153544), after reviewing the legislative history, ruled that these seamen are entitled only to leave benefits under the Annual and Sick Leave Act—that is, the same leave rights as all other Government employees have—and that there is no authority for granting the seamen leave benefits prevailing in the maritime industry.

My bill, H.R. 3002, was drafted by the Department of the Navy at my request, and would have guaranteed seamen employed by the Government leave benefits equal to those enjoyed by seamen in the maritime industry. After hearings on my bill earlier this year before our Civil Service Subcommittee, it became apparent, from Civil Service Commission reports, that full matching by the Government of industry practices, dollar for dollar and benefit for benefit, would not be practicable or desirable. Employment practices

in Government must be responsive to the public interest and necessity. The Commission stated that the industry benefit system, with its numerous variations based on position and location, is simply not suitable to Federal employment and that it would be inequitable, costly, and administratively unfeasible.

All parties concerned are in complete agreement that the disparity in leave benefits between Government and industry seamen is the principal cause of the Government's difficulty in manning its vessels, as well as the chief inequity suffered by Government-employed seamen. Enactment of H.R. 18217 will provide a large measure of relief for both the Government and its seamen. It is the official recommendation of the Administration, and has been agreed to by representatives of the AFL-CIO Government Employees Council, the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, and the National Maritime Union. Our Committee has received literally hundreds of telegrams and letters from officials of maritime union locals and individual seamen strongly endorsing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman LINDLEY BECKWORTH of our Civil Service Subcommittee, and all Members of the Subcommittee, are to be highly commended for their outstanding work in developing this legislation and bringing it to the Floor. I am confident it will be promptly enacted by this House, and have every assurance that the other body will give it early approval.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 18217.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 89-617, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. OLSEN of Montana, and Mr. NELSEN; and the following from private life: Mr. Robert Ramspeck, of Maryland; and Mr. Charles Oscar Jones, of Arizona.

RURAL RENEWAL LOANS TO LOCAL NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 688) to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and meas-

ures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 688

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010), is amended by inserting "developing and protecting recreational facilities," immediately after "protecting fish and wildlife,".

(b) Section 32(e) of title III of such Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "and local nonprofit organizations" immediately after "public agencies" each place it occurs in the first sentence thereof; and

(2) inserting "and to local nonprofit organizations" immediately after "local public agencies" in the second sentence thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is merely a broadening of the present authority to local agencies for the development of rural areas. The present law confines this authority to governmental agencies. This will extend it to nonprofit organizations in rural areas.

The basic necessity is that oftentimes the area is considerably larger than and not contiguous with the area of any governmental agency. If one tries to establish control in the hands of an agency that does not cover all of the area, one finds a loss of interest of the people in a good part of the area.

This is the same bill that has been presented to this body for a number of years by our colleague from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. The same bill was presented to our committee this year by our colleague from Iowa [Mr. BANDSTRA]. The committee reported the Bandstra bill.

We have before us the Senate bill rather than the House bill. The only substantial difference between the two is that the Senate bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture specific authority to deal with local nonprofit organizations in planning. There is no other substantial difference. Both plans provide for loans to the local organizations to assist them in carrying out development plans. While the planning assistance might be implied, specific authority therefor should assist in securing the bill's objective, which is the objective in the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, believing that he would be in a position to explain this matter rather thoroughly, I would like to yield at this time 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, this has to do with rural renewal program amendments. It will involve no additional costs. The annual appropriation for the rural renewal program will govern expenditures. The amendments set forth in the bill are recommended by the De-

partment of Agriculture. Additional amendments were also recommended by the Department but these are somewhat controversial and they are not included in the bill before you.

The present program as authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 enables local public groups to acquire lands and perform certain limited measures of development. However, the act falls short of providing one of the best possible uses of land—the development of recreation facilities.

In many areas recreational facilities are needed to justify basic resources development and to provide for the maximum use of such resources. This measure would make the rural renewal program uniform with other Farmers Home Administration programs.

The growing need for outdoor recreation facilities is well established. It is now of major importance throughout the Nation—people have time and money for recreation. It has become one of the most profitable crops a farmer can produce.

It is obvious that we have a surplus of land, at least currently, for agricultural production. This fits like a glove with the use of land for recreational purposes.

But, funds for the development of recreation areas are not easy to come by especially in areas where rural renewal efforts are needed. I am personally aware of areas where the economic growth of local communities is impeded by the lack of financing for much needed recreational facilities.

S. 688 would permit the advancement of loan funds for the development of needed recreation areas. This would be done as part of a total package of rural areas development and in support of all of the services that are available to stimulate rural economic growth.

S. 688 would also broaden the rural renewal authority to permit any corporation not operated for profit to participate in the planning and carrying out of a program of rural renewal.

As presently constituted, the rural renewal program only permits loans to public bodies. This rules out the many nonprofit groups that have been formed through the intensive rural areas development efforts of recent years.

Actually, some of the most dedicated and knowing leadership in rural America today, so far as community development is concerned, can be found in the ranks of the informal organizations that have studied and sought solutions to local rural problems.

These groups make admirable organizations for rural community development. They have the zeal, the drive, and the knowhow. But, currently they are barred from Federal rural renewal funds.

S. 688 would make it possible for the Farmers Home Administration to capitalize upon the skill, dedication, and expertise of these groups. They already are being utilized in other FHA programs. There is ample provision in existing law for security for protecting group investments.

These groups also are organized in a manner that fits the rural problem area. Unlike public bodies that are welded to set lines, a nonprofit organization can encompass part of township or an area that involves parts of two political bodies. Unlike public bodies that are limited in the functions they can assume, nonprofit groups can be organized on the broadest possible base.

I am firmly convinced after a thorough study of our initial rural renewal efforts that both of the amendments proposed in S. 688 are essential. We do need the extra authority for recreation area development if we are to meet the needs and demands of land resource development and spur economic growth and we must widen the types of organizations that can borrow funds, to include the dedicated nonprofit organizations that are struggling to rebuild rural America, if we are to provide the kind of service that is needed to the kind of people that can make the best use of rural renewal.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, of course.

Mr. POAGE. Might the gentleman not make it clear that any of these rural renewal programs contemplated here must be developed by these local agencies, and they are subject to veto by the appropriate State agency or, if there is no such State agency, by the Governor of the State involved?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct. There is ample security for any Federal funds advanced to these local nonprofit groups, just as there is under existing programs carried on by the Farmers Home Administration through such groups.

Mr. POAGE. Would the gentleman agree it is also true there is a limitation of \$250,000 in the size of any of these loans that can be made?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. POAGE. So there cannot be any large loans made under this proposal, and any project must have State approval.

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express our thanks to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for his interest in this bill and his continued interest over a good many years. I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. As he and I know, our Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit has been a very active committee, which meets frequently, and deals with a great variety of subjects. I think Mr. POAGE would agree that I am almost always there. However, I must confess, I do not remember whether we had hearings on this particular bill. I would appreciate it if he would enlighten the House on that matter.

Mr. POAGE. We held no hearings on the Senate bill. We held hearings on the House bill and heard witnesses on the House bill. As the gentleman will recall, the hearings were actually

held way back in March of this year. And, then there was another day or two that was devoted to it, within the last 6 weeks.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Would the chairman of the subcommittee refresh my memory as to this:

Did anyone appear in opposition to this legislation?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I do not recall a single witness that said he was opposed to it; no, sir.

We have a list of the witnesses here. The hearings were held on Monday morning, September 26, 1966, and there were some seven witnesses who appeared. Insofar as I can recall, every one of them was favorable to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas very much.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 688.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF NATIONALS OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST THE CHINESE COMMUNIST REGIME

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3675) to amend title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 to provide for the determination of the amounts of claims of nationals of the United States against the Chinese Communist regime.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 3675

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 501 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1643) is amended as follows:

(1) After "the Government of Cuba" at each place it appears in such section insert ", or the Chinese Communist regime,"; and

(2) After "since January 1, 1959," insert "in the case of claims against the Government of Cuba, or since October 1, 1949, in the case of claims against the Chinese Communist regime,".

SEC. 2. Section 502 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643a) is amended as follows:

(1) In paragraph (3), after "the Government of Cuba" at each place it appears insert "or the Chinese Communist regime"; and

(2) Add the following new paragraph at the end thereof:

"(5) The term 'Chinese Communist regime' means the so-called Peoples Republic of China, including any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 503 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643b) is amended as follows:

(1) After "the Government of Cuba" at each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) thereof insert ", or the Chinese Communist regime,";

(2) After "since January 1, 1959," at each place it appears in subsections (a) and (b) thereof insert "in the case of claims against the Government of Cuba, or since October 1, 1949, in the case of claims against the Chinese Communist regime,";

(3) After "within sixty days after the enactment of this title" insert "or sixty days after the enactment of the amendments made thereto with respect to claims against the Chinese Communist regime,"; and

(4) After "carrying out its functions" insert "with respect to each respective claims program authorized,".

Sec. 4. Section 505(a) of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643d) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or the Chinese Communist regime";

Sec. 5. Section 510 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 1643i) is amended by inserting "with respect to each respective claims program authorized" after "carrying out its functions".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, S. 3675 simply amends the Cuban Claims Act which the Congress passed in 1964, and amended in 1965.

This bill adds the claims of American nationals against the Chinese Communist regime, by amending title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to insert the new phrase "or the Chinese Communist regime" and other language, as appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as I know there is no opposition to this bill. It passed the other body unanimously and was voted out of the subcommittee and the full committee unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, the original Cuban Claims Act, as I am sure the Speaker will recall, passed in the House of Representatives on the Consent Calendar in 1964. Some technical amendments were added to the Cuban claims bill last year. These amendments passed the House under a suspension of the rules, but without opposition during the course of the debate thereon.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the legislation, but if there are any questions, I shall be delighted to attempt to answer them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and chairman of this subcommittee handling this bill, yielding to me at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that his all-inclusive statement, to the effect that he knows of no opposition to the bill, is true insofar as the gentleman from Missouri is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have reasonable doubts about this bill and I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin would not agree with me that one of the prime purposes of it is to keep alive the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. No, that is not quite true.

Mr. HALL. "Not quite"? How close, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is not true at all, because the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is now processing the Cuban claims and will be in operation at least until 1970. It is presently involved in the presettlement adjudication of the claims of American citizens against the Government of Cuba. The adjudication of the Cuban claims was authorized by the Congress in 1964 by Public Law 88-666 and amended in 1965 by Public Law 89-262. Public Law 88-666 and Public Law 89-262 both passed the House without opposition.

The Commission has just started to process the Cuban claims. The claims of Americans against Communist China will be processed concurrently with the adjudication of the Cuban claims. The Cuban claims are expected, as I said earlier, to be completed by 1970. The claims against Communist China either would be completed by then or within a few months thereafter, depending upon the amount and number of claims involved.

Therefore I can assure the gentleman that this legislation would not appreciably extend the life and operation of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's opinion and his statement, and I am glad to have it as a matter of legislative record. But I think probably of greatest concern to me is the question of, "Then what?"

I can full well understand, Mr. Speaker, that there is definitely value in the opinion of the gentleman and perhaps in the opinion of the Commission for having this Commission adjudicate claims while records and witnesses are still available. It would seem to me to be a terrible thing, for example, as this House acted last week on the Philippine Claims Commission, to try and seek out after 25 years some of the guerrillas that were hidden out in the hills during World War II—some of whom were friends of mine during that war, incidentally—and try to reconstitute a definite claim. And there must be a statute of limitations on time for filing and submitting such claims. And I think there even should be for private bills toward the same end. But the question of "then what?" does occur, after we get all this material correlated and confirmed or verified, the gentleman certainly would not expect that we are going to get a settlement out of the Chicomos to pay off all of these claims when they are dedicated to burying us, or hanging us from the lamp posts, and their philosophy is alien to our ideas of capitalism, or that the period will ever emerge when we can be expecting reparations. So my real fear is that, as, indeed, it is stated in the gentleman's committee report, before long we will be

coming back and asking for additional appropriations with which to settle these claims by the individuals or corporate bodies that have lost land or have lost goods in Red China. And this seems foolhardy to me. It is not a taxpayer's responsibility.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, let me explain to the gentleman that I, too, was also concerned and apprehensive as to whether a future appropriation of U.S. funds would have to be made in this regard. I want to advise the gentleman that I have no illusions that the Chicomos will pay these claims after they have been adjudicated.

I am sure, and I appreciate the gentleman's viewpoint, that we need to have these claims documented and ready for the State Department when another Government comes to power in China should a more reasonable government than the Communist government now presently ruling in China come to power we will have the documented basis on which to negotiate and settle the claims for the American-owned properties that were nationalized and expropriated by the Communists.

Concerned as the gentleman is, and I appreciate the gentleman's concern, I asked witnesses during the hearings whether they anticipated there would be any necessity in the future to appropriate U.S. funds to pay claimants. I would particularly like to call the attention of the gentleman to page 8 and page 9 of the hearings, wherein Mr. Richard D. Kearney, Deputy Legal Adviser of the State Department, replied to my questions concerning this matter. I asked Mr. Kearney:

Would you anticipate that under these circumstances there may be a request for the U.S. Government to pay such outstanding claims.

He replied:

I find it hard to speculate on this point, considering the number of people who will be involved.

I will say this, Mr. Chairman: It has been the unvarying position of the executive branch of the U.S. Government to oppose paying claims of this character out of appropriated funds.

He goes on by stating:

I will say that insofar as the disposition of the executive is concerned, we will continue to oppose any attempts to obtain such appropriations.

I might further state, Mr. Speaker, that should we have a negotiated settlement in the future, it will be necessary to get authorizing legislation in order to pay the claims after the money is made available by the foreign government. But until then there will be no need to worry about it and no appropriated funds will be necessary.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the additional appropriation that the chairman of the subcommittee refers to would presumably be out of the settlement gained with the Chinese Communists and not from appropriated funds?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. That is exactly right.

Mr. HALL. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not in all candor he con-



Public Law 89-796
89th Congress, S. 688
November 8, 1966

An Act

80 STAT. 1478

To amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional means and measures for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 31 of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010), is amended by inserting "developing and protecting recreational facilities," immediately after "protecting fish and wildlife,".

(b) Section 32(e) of title III of such Act is amended by—

(1) inserting "and local nonprofit organizations" immediately after "public agencies" each place it occurs in the first sentence thereof; and

(2) inserting "and to local nonprofit organizations" immediately after "local public agencies" in the second sentence thereof.

Approved November 8, 1966.

Agriculture.
Land conserva-
tion and util-
ization, pro-
vision.
50 Stat. 525;
76 Stat. 607.
7 USC 1011.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORT No. 2046 accompanying H. R. 13669 (Comm. on Agriculture).

SENATE REPORT No. 1676 (Comm. on Agriculture & Forestry).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 112 (1966):

Oct. 7: Considered and passed Senate.

Oct. 17: Considered and passed House, in lieu of H. R. 13669.

pact of abnormal foreign demand. Precisely the situation contemplated by the act arose earlier this year. The rapidly increasing price of cattle hides and related products, caused in large part by increasing exports, threatened the stability of prices for shoes and other leather goods. Under these circumstances the Secretary of Commerce, to whom the President's authority has been delegated, imposed export control.

Since the export control order on hides was issued, conditions in the hide market have changed, and the Secretary of Commerce has been considering suspension or modification of the export control. Therefore, no immediate economic problem is raised by the action of the Congress. However, there is no assurance that conditions in the hide market may not again change so that control would once more become necessary.

It is essential for the maintenance of our economic well-being that free enterprise and responsible Government be able to work together in a timely fashion. The Export Control Act recognizes this, as do numerous other laws passed by Congress.

But in this rider to the Commerce Department appropriation, Congress attempts to control the manner in which the Export Control Act is to be administered. I am directing the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Budget to prepare for submission to the next Congress a proposal removing this restriction upon the prompt and flexible response required to protect the public's economic interest.

In the meantime, I am requesting the Secretary of Commerce and the Council of Economic Advisers to watch closely the volume of hide exports and the prices of hides, leather, and shoes. We must rely on the self-restraint and responsibility of hide exporters to avoid undue pressure on hide prices. I express my hope that manufacturers of leather and shoes will not use the removal of export controls as an invitation to increase prices.

NOTE: The statement was released at San Antonio, Tex. As enacted, H. R. 18119 is Public Law 89-797.

International Conference on Water for Peace

Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill Authorizing the Conference and Funds for Its Cost. November 8, 1966

Last year I announced that the United States would convene a great international conference to deal with the world's water problems.

Today I am signing into law a bill that authorizes the conference and funds to defray its cost.

Next May in Washington, experts from many nations will gather to examine a common necessity: providing adequate, clean, and dependable water supplies for their people.

In the past, many of man's efforts to solve his water problems failed because he did not possess the tools, the technology, or the understanding to do the job. That is no longer the case. The question now is whether the competence he possesses can be translated into action where it is needed.

I believe that question can be answered "yes"—if experts from throughout the world can meet and match skills with needs—and if the nations join in a global effort to help one another.

The International Conference on Water for Peace will deal with some of the oldest water problems, and some that have been aggravated by modern life. It will study

- relief from drought and protection from floods;
- the waterborne diseases that kill 5 million people every year;
- the pollution of rivers, lakes, and streams, a major problem for the developed and less developed nations alike.

I do not expect that simple answers to these problems will emerge from the conference. But I do believe that by sharing what we now know with each other, we shall take the necessary first step toward providing generations to come with the water they will need to exist.

NOTE: The statement was released at San Antonio, Tex. As enacted, the bill (S. J. Res. 167) is Public Law 89-799.

Extension of the War on Poverty

Statement by the President Upon Signing the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966. November 8, 1966

Twenty-six months ago, I signed into law this Nation's declaration of war against poverty, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. At that time I said:

"Our American answer to poverty is not to make the poor more secure in their poverty but to reach down and to help them lift themselves out of the ruts of poverty and move with the large majority along the high road of hope and prosperity."

On that August day, there were more than 34 million Americans living in acute want and deprivation. Even though they lived among us in our cities and our rural communities, they were largely ignored and unheard. Most Americans were unaware of their existence. Between them and the America of abundance known to most of us there were almost no bridges they could cross.

That was 2 years ago. So much has happened since then that it is almost impossible to believe so short a time has passed.

Now, the majority of Americans recognize the problem of poverty in our Nation and are determined to defeat it.

Now, local leadership in the cities, in the counties, and in the States is moving forward in partnership with the Federal Government, to design programs for fighting this national ill.

Now, some 1,000 communities are mobilized through Community Action to fight the hometown battle against conditions which keep people poor.

Now, just over 2 years after this declaration of war on poverty was signed, we have dynamic programs in action which have captured the imagination and the support of the largest volunteer army in our history:

- The Head Start program has over 1 million of our poor preschool children—and through them, their parents and families.
- There is the Job Corps in which more than 30,000 young men and women are being trained for more productive lives.
- There is the Neighborhood Youth Corps which has provided meaningful employment to more than 750,000 poor youth.
- There are more than 3,500 Vista Volunteers living and working among the poor in the finest spirit of American sharing and helping.
- We have legal services bringing justice to the poor, and neighborhood centers—more than 600 of them—focusing a variety of services in the areas where they are most needed.
- We have Upward Bound, the Foster Grandparents program, Neighborhood Health Centers, and new activity on our Indian reservations and in migrant camps.
- Special loan programs are helping our rural poor. Almost one-third of our poverty funds are going to rural America.

Still it is not enough. We cannot rest until every man and woman and child has been helped out of the abyss of poverty.

We will continue to move forward against this enemy. We will continue to mount an attack which has already helped bring more than 2 million people out of poverty over the past 2 years.

I am proud of what has been accomplished under the leadership of Sargent Shriver and this administration. We intend to continue the war against poverty with a determination strengthened by our progress over the past 2 years.

NOTE: The statement was released at San Antonio, Tex. As enacted, the bill (H.R. 15111) is Public Law 89-794.

Veto Authority of Congressional Committees

Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill Amending the Bankhead-Jones Act and Expressing Objections to Certain Provisions. November 8, 1966

I have today signed S. 688, amending the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to

- permit rural renewal loans to be made to local non-profit organizations;
- authorize these loans to be made for developing and protecting recreational facilities.

These are useful changes which should enhance the effectiveness of the rural renewal program, and I commend the Congress for enacting them.

I regret, however, that the Congress did not see fit to adopt an administration recommendation that an unconstitutional provision in the Bankhead-Jones Act be eliminated.

That provision prohibits any appropriation for a single rural renewal loan in excess of \$250,000 unless the loan has been approved by resolutions adopted by the House and Senate Agriculture Committees.

As I pointed out in my signing statement last year on S. 2300—the omnibus rivers and harbors bill—provisions requiring committee approval such as this are repugnant to the Constitution. They represent an improper encroachment by the Congress and its committees upon Executive responsibilities, and dilute and diminish the authority and powers of the Presidency. I also indicated that I could not accept such an infringement on the Office of the Presidency.

At my instruction, the Departments of the Army, Agriculture, and the Interior, and the General Services Administration submitted draft legislation to the 89th Congress to repeal several committee veto provisions contained in existing law and affecting their agencies. Also at my instruction, the objectionable procedures will not be used to submit projects to future Congresses.

The provision involved in this program is substantially the same as those I have objected to before, and it should be treated in the same manner.

Accordingly, I am instructing the Secretary of Agriculture to submit legislation to the 90th Congress to repeal the committee approval provision in the Bankhead-Jones Act, and in the meantime to refrain from making any loans which would require committee approval. That provision has not been invoked in the past and it shall not be in the future.

I urge the Congress to take prompt action next session on this legislation, as well as on the other proposals for the repeal of similar provisions.

By this statement, I do not mean to imply that I would be opposed to a reasonable reporting provision, consistent with the legislative prerogatives of the Congress and the executive prerogatives of the Office of the Presidency.

NOTE: The statement was released at San Antonio, Tex. As enacted, the bill (S. 688) is Public Law 89-796.

Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia

Announcement of the President's Approval of the Assignment of Col. Robert E. Mathe To Succeed Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke. November 8, 1966

The President today approved the recommendation of Army Secretary Stanley R. Resor to detail Col. Robert E. Mathe, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, as Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia. He will succeed Brig. Gen. Charles M. Duke, United States Army, who assumed duties as Engineer Commissioner in June 1963.

Colonel Mathe was born April 21, 1920, in Oshkosh, Wis., and graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1943. He holds a master's degree in civil engineering from the University of Illinois and is a graduate of the Army's Command and General Staff College and the Army War College. Colonel Mathe is presently assigned as Corps Engineer of VII Corps in Germany. He served as Assistant Engineer Commissioner in the District of Columbia from 1955 to 1958.

Colonel Mathe is married and has five children.

The assignment traditionally calls for the rank of brigadier general, and Colonel Mathe's name was included in a list of individuals recommended for temporary promotion to brigadier general and sent to the Senate on August 18, 1966.

NOTE: The announcement was released at San Antonio, Tex.

Investment Credit and Accelerated Depreciation Allowance

Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill Temporarily Suspending the Tax Credit To Combat Inflation. November 8, 1966

I have today signed legislation which suspends temporarily the investment tax credit on machinery and equipment and accelerated depreciation on buildings. This legislation was submitted to the Congress on Septem-

ber 8, as a vital part of our effort to combat inflationary pressures and to preserve the strength of our dynamic economy.

This measure will help:

- restore more normal interest rates and ease tight money and credit conditions;
- free funds and resources for homebuilding and other essential uses;
- trim down excessive backlogs of machinery orders;
- curb upward pressures on prices and costs of capital goods;
- guard against a needless repetition of the old pattern of boom and bust in capital spending; and
- improve our current balance of payments position.

The great 89th Congress deserves to be commended by the American people for its prompt, vigorous, and responsible action on this legislation. The House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, and the leadership and Members of the House and Senate all demonstrated decisiveness and responsibility in a difficult task. Once more the Congress and the administration have shown that they can and will work together for stable prosperity in our free economy.

Because of a unique combination of economic demands at home and pressures generated by our defense of freedom in southeast Asia, it became necessary to suspend the investment credit. But we look forward to its help once again to achieve our objective of a high investment, technologically dynamic, growth-oriented economy. As I have said before, "This is a firm, long-term plan that we intend to carry out. A high level of business investment is indispensable to our prosperity and our economic growth."

The legislation which I have signed provides for automatic restoration of these special tax provisions in January 1968. If, however, any earlier reinstatement would be appropriate, I shall recommend prompt legislative action to accomplish that result.

Meanwhile, our financial markets have already delivered a verdict on this measure. The rise in interest rates during the first 8 months of this year was reversed early in September. Today, long-term rates are down roughly $\frac{1}{4}$ percentage point from their late summer peaks. Security markets are behaving with orderly confidence. It is clear that we are ready to use a two-way fiscal policy to promote the cause of stable prosperity—to stimulate a lagging economy or to restrain one threatened with excess demand.

At the time I proposed this measure, I also suspended for the time being the sales of Federal participation certificates to relieve financial market pressures. Finally, I announced that vigorous action would be taken to hold down and cut back Federal nondefense spending and that action is underway.

I can assure the Nation that our free and vigorous economy and responsible government will work together to continue the greatest prosperity in our history. I renew my pledge to the American people to take whatever action is necessary to maintain this unprecedented record.

NOTE: The statement was released at San Antonio, Tex. As enacted, the bill (H.R. 17607) is Public Law 89-800.

Chamizal Highway Bill

Statement by the President Upon Signing Bill Authorizing a New Highway Along the Rio Grande. November 8, 1966

The Chamizal highway bill brings us one step further toward the goals we established concluding the treaty of 1963 with Mexico.

That historic agreement removed a 100-year-old source of contention between our two nations. The United States and Mexico transferred lands to one another, and agreed to a new boundary and relocation of the Rio Grande at El Paso.

By the act I shall sign today, a new highway is authorized parallel to the adjusted boundary and downstream along the Rio Grande. With the 40-acre Chamizal Memorial Park, it will symbolize the good faith that made the agreement possible.

The State of Texas or the city of El Paso will share with the United States in the costs of constructing the highway. This is right and proper—for both the State and the city have helped to create and sustain the human relationships that form the real tie between our peoples.

We have no closer, nor any more meaningful bonds with any nation, than we have with Mexico. Each of our peoples travels frequently and in great numbers to the other's country; and the culture of each has become part of the other. I believe that coming decades will find us growing even closer together—proud, independent, yet mutually enriching friends. Chamizal, long the subject of dispute between us, now becomes the emblem of that friendship.

NOTE: The statement was released at San Antonio, Tex. As enacted, the bill (H.R. 11555) is Public Law 89-795.

The Crusade Against Crime

Statement by the President Upon Signing Three Bills Designed To Assist in the National Attack Against Crime. November 8, 1966

I today have signed three bills which will help us carry on our crusade against crime.

These measures flow from the recommendations I made in my message to Congress on crime earlier this year. Separately, each bill is important. Together they form a vital part of our national effort to bring new dimensions to law enforcement and the administration of justice.

The first is the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act—a pioneering measure. It recognizes that treating addicts as criminals neither curtails addiction nor prevents crime.

Under this law, many addicts now can be committed for treatment instead of being committed to prison.

This new law will help reclaim lives. It will help end the chain reaction of misery, where addicts turn to crime to support their addiction.

The need is great. There are more than 50,000 narcotics addicts in our country. Many of them can respond to treatment and become useful and productive citizens. At the same time, it is important to recognize that the law retains full criminal sanctions against those ruthless men who sell despair—the narcotics peddlers.

The second measure creates a national commission to recommend complete revisions of the Federal criminal statutes. Some of our criminal laws are obsolete. Others do not make the penalty fit the crime. All must be reviewed in light of the experience and the requirements of our complex and growing society.

This bill establishes a 12-member bipartisan commission which will include Members of each House of the Congress, Federal judges, and three appointees whom I will name shortly.

The task of this commission is to make a detailed and penetrating study of the Federal statutes and case law and recommend to the Congress the legislation necessary to improve the Federal system of criminal justice. Our goal is a modern, rational, criminal code that is fully consistent with our dedication to justice and the protection of our citizens. The commission will take us a long step closer to that goal.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1965 has stirred the imagination of everyone concerned with police work—from the academic criminologist to the prosecuting attorney and the policeman on the beat. It has a simple and exciting premise: the Federal Government would award grants to local agencies and nonprofit groups for a variety of experimental approaches to all phases of the law enforcement field.

The response to the 1965 act has been overwhelming.

Now, in this third measure, the Congress has enlarged the promising start of the 1965 act by extending the program to 1970. Hundreds of imaginative proposals for new projects are presently under consideration. The program recognizes that the work of law enforcement is and must be primarily a local responsibility. But it also demonstrates that close partnership between the Federal Government and State and local governments in this area can bring substantial rewards.

U.S.D.A.
SEA/TIS
LAW LIBRARY
ROOM 1406 SOUTH
WASHINGTON D.C. 20250